

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/043,587	01/10/2002	Steven Zettel	0499-036 6331		
7590 12/27/2005			EXAM	EXAMINER	
Bradley N. Ruben			TRAN, HIEN THI		
463 First Street Suite 5A			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Hoboken, NJ 07030-1859			1764		

DATE MAILED: 12/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/043,587	ZETTEL, STEVEN	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Hien Tran	1764	

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Hien Tran	1764						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 19 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.						
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.					
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	06.07(f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	36(a) and the appropria of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	te extension fee iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as					
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of the appeal. Since					
AMENDMENTS  3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered by	ecause					
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ul>	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);						
<ul> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) They present additional claims without canceling a</li> </ul>			tne issues for					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
<ul> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ul>	: specification objection.	•						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	-						
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .		I be entered and an e	explanation of					
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4-6,8-16,18 and 21</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a					
10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio								
<ul> <li>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> <li>11.               ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered buoth the same reasons set forth in the final office action.      </li> </ul>	at does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)						
13.   ☐ Other: see attached sheets.		Hen Tran						
		Hien Tran Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1764						

Application/Control Number: 10/043,587

Art Unit: 1764

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/19/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that page 8, lines 12-17 discloses that the air blockage points 32 (Fig. 4) which acts as dams, or raised portion and therefore the structures with corrugations are improperly considered by the examiner to be "dams" as claimed. However, it is not clear from Fig. 4 that any dams are provided. Since it is unclear from the drawings as set forth above, any corrugation structures with peaks and valleys can be considered as dams or raised portions.

Applicant argues that Yamada only shows a mesh, not whether such is woven or knitted.

Such contention is not persuasive as the secondary reference, Harding, is relied upon for teaching the method of forming the wire mesh, e.g. knitting and crimping method.

Applicant argues that Harding only shows a knitted wire mesh rope buried in the knitted mesh sheet at the end of the converter, which acts as a seal, not to stop the gas flow by altering the configuration of the knitted mesh. Such contention is not persuasive as set forth above, the secondary reference, Harding, is relied upon for teaching that the wire mesh layer may be formed by knitting method and have crimped corrugations.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the method of forming the device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself.

Applicant argues that Machida teaches away from using a wire mesh. Such contention is not persuasive as Machida is only relied upon for teaching the conventionality of using non-intumescent material as an insulation material.

Art Unit: 1764

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hien Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-1454. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 7:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HT

Hien Tran Primary Examiner Art Unit 1764

Hren Tran